

newspaper of which his Secretary was the editor.

Mr. Gibson said no paper editor was his lieutenant; they were all ready to criticize him faithfully or otherwise. The President had referred to his course as President of the Boards of Education and Health. That his course had been so high handed he felt it impossible to associate with him. Mr. Rhodes was in the Board when a certain salary was commented on. He was in the minority. His main objection was that the sum was too much for a lady. His (Mr. G.) policy was to do them honor and render them service under any circumstance. (Loud applause.) The resolution which was passed, authorized the President in connection with the Inspector-General of Schools to raise certain salaries.

Mr. Rhodes—It is not so; Mr. Gibson read the resolution.

Resolution June 15th, 1883.

PRESENT. His Ex. W. M. Gibson.  
Hon. G. Rhodes.  
Hon. D. L. Kinnimaka.  
Also D. D. Baldwin.

On the motion of the President it was Resolved, that the President of the Board, in consultation with the Inspector-General of Schools, be authorized to take into consideration the subject of an increase of salaries of some of the subordinate teachers in the English day schools of the district of Honolulu, and refer the same to the Board at a future meeting.

(Here a sharp altercation took place between the Minister and the President, which necessitated the Chairman calling them to order.)

Mr. Gibson read a second resolution approving of the action taken by the President of the Board.

Resolution, August 17th, 1883.

The President reported to the Board the action taken on the subject of the salaries of the Honolulu English School teachers, agreeably with his understanding of a resolution on the subject passed at the last meeting of the Board, and read a schedule of the salaries as they were and as they now stand increased \* \* \* \* \* All of which action, on the motion of Hon. J. S. Walker, it was Resolved by the Board to approve.

PRESENT. His Ex. W. M. Gibson.  
J. M. Kapena.  
Hon. J. S. Walker.

(Mr. Rhodes had resigned from the Board before this resolution was passed.)

Mr. Gibson continued—In his (the President's) selection of members of the Finance Committee, he stated that he had no knowledge of their opposition to the Government, but that he discovered it afterwards. He could only say that it displayed a remarkable state of ignorance in regard to the state of the country. He said "he breathed a polluted atmosphere owing to the money that was used for election purposes." At the same time he had appointed on Committees those who were free from corruption, and not so elected, therefore in opposition to the Government. Strange that his discernment was so good in one respect and so weak in another. In another breath he states he was not aware that there was any opposition to the Government. The hon. gentleman said he had been his friend. He said "my actions were insulting."

Mr. Gibson addressed a note to Mr. Rhodes, asking him if he substantiated what he had been reported to have said in a paragraph in Friday's Bulletin. Mr. Rhodes said it was incorrect.

Mr. Gibson proceeded. He said it was not only incorrect, but maliciously represents the discussion on this floor. The Hon. gentleman said "we parted company as friends." He regretted the circumstances. It was not at a time when he was domineering, but when the clouds were lowering. It was on 14th Sept. of last year. He had been accused of Caesarism. There was no Caesarism in his actions, but at such time he felt like Caesar and said *et tu Brute*. (Loud applause.) Yes, Mr. Chairman, at that time, on that 14th September when the air was rife with rumors of a change of Cabinet, when it was considered sure on all sides that he (Mr. G.) would be obliged to go out of office. It was at that dark period when he did not appear to have a friend except his colleagues and His Majesty, God bless him. He was an honest man, an honorable and prudent man to leave a sinking ship. (Loud and continued applause.)

He would be glad to come to a vote on this report. The Finance Committee is a painstaking work and very excellent in many respects. He approved of two-thirds of the report. In fact there was so much to approve of that he moved it be received and laid on the table.

Mr. Kean rose and said, as will be observed by the report, he was one of the Finance Committee. He knew what it contained. He did not sign the report on account of malice, but because he was satisfied of the truth contained in the report. He did not endorse everything in the report, but a great many things he did endorse. He did not agree with the Committee in the matter of \$500 for salary of the Minister of the Interior, said to have been overdrawn. He was satisfied it was a mistake, and though he signed the report he stated at the time to the Committee that he would explain his views in the Assembly. It is true he did not understand English books and accounts, and he consequently took a

memorandum of what he was told. There were certain parts of the report of which he had no memorandum, and consequently could not endorse. He referred to the transfer of \$1,200 from the A. G.'s department to the department of Foreign Affairs. He asked the Attorney-General for an explanation.

The Attorney-General promised he would explain.

Mr. Kean proceeded. He said the Committee went into the Marshal's office, but the books being kept in English he was at a loss to criticize them. All the work there was accomplished in about twenty minutes, and passing on to the Supreme Court, they spent even less time there than in the Marshal's office.

(Here he read from that part of the report referring to the Judiciary Department.)

He thought the report of the Committee on the Department of Judiciary was brief and incorrect. There were sums paid out over and above the appropriation in that department that are not stated in the report. Had they reported in full, it would, in his opinion, have made the report stronger. He did not understand the report to say the Ministry had taken money for themselves, but that they had taken money from one appropriation and applied it to another. If the Ministers have done wrong, the Judges of the Supreme Court have done wrong also. He did not think the Ministers had acted in violation of article 15 of the Constitution.

Attorney-General Neumann said, that on this report, which he could not but help to again term in every way incomplete, there have been arguments by Hon. members more to the point than in the report itself. The question asked pertinently by the Hon. Widemann as to "What right the Government disposed of Government funds except by Legislative action?" He said, "None." In speaking of the report it would be again necessary to refer to the minor points. They were explained to the Committee in his office, he hoped to the satisfaction of the House. It therefore only remained to answer judicious questions that had been asked, among which the Hon. Member for Honolulu asked if there was any law by which the Ministers could spend money without the consent of the Legislature, and wants him to read that law. The other member for Hilo (Mr. Hitchcock) asked, "Shall money received be paid out without an appropriation?" This Hon. Member had told the House that some years ago a Minister drew money from the Treasury and placed it to his private account in the bank. Of course the Hon. Member claims that was an unjustifiable act, in which he (the A. G.) agreed. He would attempt to show the Assembly that no such act had been committed by this Ministry. The Hon. Kean wanted him to explain the transfer of \$1,200 from the A. G.'s department to the Foreign Office department, and also whether the Cabinet resolutions passed were in accordance with law. A similar question came from the Hon. Member for Lihue.

1st.—With reference to the payment by the A. G. of freight on armament. Shortly after he went into office, members of the Cabinet and some gentlemen about town had spoken to him with considerable apprehension with regard to the state of affairs on the island of Kauai. These statements were not made by persons on whom he could not rely. A gentleman representing diplomatic interests drew his attention to it and said if no steps were taken he would cause a man-of-war to come here from the country he had the honor to represent. He had no love for military pomp or anything of that sort. The state of affairs on Kauai and Maui looked anomalous. The Chinese had formed a conspiracy and some harm was expected from them. What to do under the circumstances he did not know. He did not know whether there were any police or troops available, but on consultation with his Majesty in Cabinet Council he agreed to take two light field pieces and send on to Mr. Wilcox at Kauai and the other to Mr. Everett on Maui. He purchased horses and expected the men would be trained by a man that was there. He stated that he would pay \$1,200 and take two pieces, with consent of His Majesty in Cabinet Council. Shortly after that time he concluded he would do nothing. Things remained *in statu quo*, and he determined that they should continue so until after the Legislature had taken some steps with regard to mounted police. He found in the Appropriation Bill an armed force item. He did not hesitate to make the arrangements. He deemed it judicious, and he had the responsibility of doing it; so far as the transfer was concerned, he had the same right as for every other expense out of this fund. If the Finance Committee had asked, he would have made that statement to them. On all occasions the Hon. member for Wailuku has ridiculed the mounted police. He did what others suggested, and not what those who always ridicule what is done by the Government would suggest. His impressions were gained from gentlemen of experience. The question is not, is it a wise one? He deemed it so, and resolved to take them if His Majesty give them to him. The Committee on Finance did nothing but set forward statements, which unexplained are of

a doubtful character, but if explained, there was nothing in them. He claimed he was justified in paying out this money in the manner and for the purpose he did—just as much as buying horses—which he did, and also accoutrements to be left to the Legislature to decide. The Hon. member has well said if there was any responsibility in mistaking the law, that responsibility falls on the A. G. Two resolutions were passed on February 10th, and he thought the Committee on Finance should have obtained copies and embodied them in their report.

(Reads from C. C. resolution re indemnity account bill.)

He claimed that under the Loan Act it was perfectly legitimate for ministers to appropriate certain sums for certain purposes, and after consulting one of the best lawyers in this town, he advised his colleagues. At the close of the fiscal period \$50,000 was drawn from the money appropriated for roads and bridges, though it had not all been spent, other amounts were expended, some in taking soundings with the intent to lay telegraph wires. It was done because the English Company and also another Company would not contract unless the Government took its own soundings. The law says it was not to be used for any other purpose. That is the extent under the law which the Ministry is forbidden to use money. It is a law point. He was satisfied they had not violated the law, but that is not sufficient; other members might entertain different opinions. He was in the habit of relying on himself; but on this important matter he asked another legal gentleman's opinion, and he agreed with him.

Referring to the appointment of committees. He read from the report of the PACIFIC COMMERCIAL ADVERTISER, remarking that reporters do not usually make mistakes. "There had never been known in parliamentary history of an instance of the minority holding a grand jury inquest. Far be it from him to blame the President in so doing, because he (Mr. N.) thought he did it for the best interest of the country." That there was anything satirical or that he had used double language, was unjust to him. That he criticized the Committee on Finance is true, but the President had no need to father that. That he had a right to criticize was not the question, but it was the manner in which it had been presented. In the course of his previous remarks he had said some things that were facetious. The lawyers in the Committee understood how to take it. But it was left to a young David to come forth with a sling on his tongue to their defense. The gentlemen addressed were better able to defend themselves perhaps, not so wittily, but more effectively. When he first read the Committee report he was at a loss to find out where such cheap wit and paltry badinage came from.

Mr. W. O. Smith remarked that it was not fair to give the Hon. Godfrey Brown credit for all that was written in the report.

The Attorney-General added, "No, I am not giving him credit for having written anything sensible in it."

He went on to say this Chairman is possessed of some histrionic powers, he was reported to be a very good low comedian but he had never seen him perform before yesterday. Some wit had stated that he gathered it from those venerable repositories, the Almanacs, and let it out in the House. (Laughter.) He considered that the Hon. member for Kohala had mistaken his profession as an embryo statesman; he does pretty well but he could do better at something else. \* \* \* \* \* He only surmised that there was personal hostility to himself, but after the vapors of the Chairman of the Committee inflicted on the House yesterday, he concluded his surmises were correct. He denied his right to trundle him in the way in which he had done. He had other rights here than those of a Cabinet Minister. "Nemo me impune lacessit." He contended there was animus in what had been said. Some poet said "Hell knows no fury like a woman's scorn." Next to a "woman's scorn" no one knows more fury than an office-holder that has been kicked out. The Chairman of the Finance Committee once occupied an honorable position in this House now occupied by another who is more able, and more discreet in the fulfillment of his duties. He was removed, not for dishonesty, far from him (the A. G.) to convey such an idea (A voice, "you cannot") no, but I will tell you why he was removed.

Mr. Cecil Brown rose to a point of order. He objected to the Attorney-General making any such statement.

Mr. Dole also rose.

After considerable excitement, and a little confusion, the Chairman ruled that any such statement would be out of order, and was not pertinent to the question.

The Attorney-General submitted to the ruling without an appeal. He said he was sorry, after the manner in which he had been attacked yesterday, the Chair would not give him a chance to set himself right before the House. He did not desire that any newspaper inference should be drawn from what he had said about the dismissal of the member for Kohala from the office of Registrar of Public Accounts. He had nothing more to say for the present.

Mr. Godfrey Rhodes stepped forward and stated he withdrew all he had said on the

previous day of an offensive nature. He said he had been insulted, his character assailed as an honorable man and a Christian gentleman. He had put some papers in the hands of Mr. W. O. Smith, who would read them.

Mr. Gibson thought they ought to be read by the Secretary.

Mr. J. Richardson rose to a point of order.

Mr. Smith made a few remarks that were inaudible owing to the confusion.

Mr. Palohans said this was not the matter before the House.

Mr. Smith said they had a bearing on what had been said.

Mr. Ahelo said the reading of the documents would tend to an indefinite argument.

Mr. Gibson said the documents did not come under the discussion before the Assembly.

At last Mr. Smith read the documents by permission of the Chair. They comprised copies of the resolutions previously read by Mr. Gibson, and a letter of resignation from the Board of Education.

Mr. Widemann said he surmised who the lawyer was that the Attorney-General alluded to, as he had conversed with the gentleman on the same subject. It was Mr. Preston. He maintained that the Minister of Finance was prohibited from paying out moneys collected as taxes. It was no man's business to take money out of the Treasury and put it into another treasury. The money he referred to has not been spent. In theory they cannot find any excuse for this. He referred to the Legislature of 1882, of which he was a member, and told the members to do as he did then.

Mr. Dole introduced a resolution that when the Committee rose they recommend the Assembly to express its want of confidence in the present Ministry.

He said that after three days debate they had reached the bottom of what they had under consideration. Every time the Ministers got upon their feet they sank deeper and deeper in the mire. They looked like lassoed bullocks, which the more they wriggled and squirmed to get away from their captors, only drew the rope tighter round their necks. So with the Ministers. He did not see that they had made any progress whatever. He referred to what the Attorney-General had said about money having been drawn from the Treasury for which there was no appropriation. The first day the members of the Cabinet barely alluded to the more serious charges of the report. The second day the Minister of Foreign Affairs does not think that they have misappropriated public funds. The third day the Attorney-General frankly admits that there is no power under the sun whereby money can be legally drawn from the Treasury save the Legislative Assembly and the Privy Council. By their own mouths they are guilty. He quoted at length from the report of the Finance Committee of 1878, when Mr. Gibson was Chairman, and showed what a different policy he had adopted since he became a Minister. He even forgot to terminate the report with "God Save the King." (Laughter.) It was an unpleasant duty to speak of the Ministers in their official capacity. The Minister of Foreign Affairs may thank his particular deity that the clause he recommended to be inserted in the Appropriation Bill in 1878 did not pass, or he might now have been on trial for his liberty or have been in a bi-colored suit working on our roads.

The Attorney-General had made an ingenious explanation. He opposed the heaviest charges by saying that the appropriations made by Cabinet resolutions were made under the authority of the Loan Act. Why then did they call a Cabinet Council to authorize their action? Legal appropriations require no Cabinet resolution. They all knew that what they were doing was illegal but they dared to take the consequences. Under the management of a Cabinet like this, the country would run into debt and would be in a manner mortgaged to some one. He referred to the Appropriation Bill of 1882 and pointed out that the only reason all the appropriations had not been spent was because they did not have the money, and had not sufficient credit for borrowing it.

An eternal gobble of turkeys had been heard from beginning to end of this discussion, until this might very well in future be known as the turkey Cabinet, inasmuch as they have shown such a disposition to gobble up public funds. There has not been one supporter of the Government in this discussion except those who hold offices under the Government. He felt sorry for the fifth member of the Finance Committee, the Hon. member for Honolulu. He had a certain amount of admiration for the member, but he appeared to be trying to ride two horses at one time. Unfortunately the horses were going in different directions, and he could not accomplish his object without falling.

Mr. Dole admitted that he did not know what the rules of promotion were in the Government service. The present Minister of Finance was removed from the Post Office owing to his inability to cope with the Foreign money order system, and promoted to the Finance Office. The Minister of Interior was in 1878 chief clerk in the department of

which he is now the head. He was then removed for confusion in his accounts.

He next referred to the Auditor-General's Act and the manner in which it had been misapplied. Also to corrupt contracts. He said that in the uses of public funds, the gravest charges had been brought against the Ministry. To draw money from the Treasury without the consent of the Privy Council was a revolution; it was an insult to the House, to His Majesty, and to the people. The political ascendancy is slipping from the Hawaiians into the hands of the white man. To-day he is a factor, to-day he is a voter; if things go on as they are going, he will soon belong to the lower elements of society, and will sink out of sight as a political power. The gentlemen of the Cabinet are revolutionists. He asked who would entrust their business to such men? He called upon them to vote on sound business principles, as the Government was of more importance than any business house in the Kingdom.

In the course of his address Mr. Dole was frequently interrupted with loud applause from the audience.

Mr. Gibson said the Hon. gentleman who had just sat down has given them a violent harangue on very slight or no foundation at all. He has said no member supported the Government who was not an officeholder. It is because those who were opposed to the Government were seeking for office.

He has presented a state of things that the "wish is father to the thought." That is his own natural thought. When he came to this country he engaged in discussing things opposed to Monarchical Government. He has tried to draw a contrast between the condition of the past and the present. Mr. Gibson next referred to the hospital at Wailuku. He explained the Hospital appropriation and expenditures connected therewith. They had presented everything fully in their Finance report. They had hidden nothing. The action of the Ministry is before the members, nobles and the whole country, and they had nothing to be ashamed of. He would now leave it to the vote of the representatives.

Mr. Ahelo spoke in favor of laying the report on the table and in conclusion he moved the Committee rise.

Mr. Pilipo desired to speak. After a consultation between the Chairman and the President of the Assembly it was ruled in order to put the question that "the Committee now rise."

The vote was taken and carried by 22 to 14.

At 6.20 p.m., the House adjourned until 10 a.m. on Monday.

THIRTY-SEVENTH DAY.

MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1884.

House met at 10 a.m.

Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.

PETITIONS.

Mr. Kamakele presented a petition from Makawao, praying that a subsidy be granted for running a line of steamers from Maui to San Francisco. Laid on table.

Mr. Dole presented a petition from Chinese merchants protesting against the Act requiring them to keep their books in either the Hawaiian or English languages.

There were a large number of petitions presented against the Bank Charter Bill.

Mr. Godfrey Brown reported from the Select Committee on the bill to amend Section 498 of the Civil Code, recommending that it be laid on table.

Report of the Committee was adopted.

Mr. Ahelo, Chairman of the Select Committee appointed to report on the bill to facilitate mail communication between Hawaii and San Francisco, asked for further time. Granted.

Mr. Hitchcock presented a resolution that the Minister of Finance lay before the House a statement of taxes collected in each district for the past biennial period. Carried.

Mr. Kean moved that the bill to provide a permanent settlement for Mrs. Kinnimaka, be taken from the table and placed on the order of the day for to-morrow.

On motion of Mr. Dole, the bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Pilipo moved that as the copies of the Appropriation Bill, furnished by the Minister of Finance, are not printed on good paper, the same be referred to the Printing Committee to be presented in a more acceptable form.

After a brief discussion the motion was carried.

Mr. Bishop, Chairman of the Education Committee reported on the bill relating to the endorsement of a chair for chemistry and national science in Oahu College recommending that the bill pass. Report was adopted, and bill ordered to be read a third time on Thursday next.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Consideration of the Appropriation Bill in Committee of the Whole.

Several discrepancies were pointed out in the printed form of the bill.

At 11.45 a.m. the House took a recess until 1 p.m., the Minister of Finance having stated that on reassembling he would produce the original document.

The House reassembled at 1 p.m.

The Minister of Finance presented the